



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,306	09/22/2005	Kiyotaka Nakabayashi	277053US6PCT	1134
22850	7590	04/21/2009		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER MISLEH, JUSTIN P	
			ART UNIT 2622	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 04/21/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, filed April 7, 2009, with respect to independent Claim 5 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive; however, Applicant's arguments with respect to independent Claims 1 and 5 have been considered but are moot in view additional consideration required for amendments narrowing those claims.

2. With respect to Claim 5, Applicant argues, "as can be seen in Yamashita Fig. 1, there is no selection of desired shooting mode information from pieces of set shooting mode information, each of the pieces of shooting mode information including information concerning a specific color determined depending on a predetermined shooting condition as recited in independent [Claim 5]. Nor does Yamashita describe a shooting mode selection device connected to luminance value setting device 3 as recited in those claims ... the Office Action fails to consider or treat the language at the end of Claim 5 reciting 'a luminance correction device configured to correct the luminance level of the video signals depending on... the basis of the shooting mode information selected by the shooting mode selection device.'"

3. The Examiner respectfully submits the arguments regarding Claim 5 are substantially the same as the arguments filed September 2, 2009. The Examiner addressed these arguments Final Rejection mailed January 7, 2009. The Examiner respectfully submits Applicant has not considered Examiner's remarks in the Final Rejection. For Applicant's convenience, the remarks are reproduced below:

4. "As for [Claim 5], it has already been established that ACPA discloses a shooting mode selection device (120A) configured to select desired shooting mode information from pieces of set shooting mode information, each of the pieces of shooting mode information including

Art Unit: 2622

information concerning a specific color determined depending on a predetermined shooting condition (see Specification, page 3, lines 2 – 8) and a color correction value calculation device (130A) configured to select correction reference data corresponding to the specific color from the correction reference data storage device (“table data”) on the basis of the shooting mode information selected by the shooting mode selection device (120A). Yamashita et al. was introduced to show a luminance correction device (3 and 8) for correcting the luminance level of the video signals depending on the luminance level of the specific-color video signals extracted by the specific color extraction device (see column 5, line 57 – column 6, line 16). Since, ACPA already shows the correction of video signals based on a shooting mode correction, the addition of the luminance correction device would not change that fact. Therefore, the luminance correction would also be performed on the basis of the shooting mode selection. For this reason, the rejection of [Claim 5] will also be maintained.”

/Justin P Misleh/**Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2622**